DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 301 936 EA 020 466

AUTHOR Donaldson, Gordon A., Jr.; Seager, Andrew
TITLE Field-Initiated Administrator Competency Development: A Pilot Experience.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988). Appendices may reproduce poorly due to broken and blurred print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Administrator Evaluation; *Administrator Qualifications; *Administrators; *Certification; Elementary Secondary Education; Field Experience Programs; *Internship Programs; Professional Education; *State Legislation
IDENTIFIERS Administrator Action Plan (Maine); Maine

ABSTRACT

Maine Bill L.D. 1228, passed in June 1985, changed the groundrules for administrator certification, giving district-based administrators and others (as opposed to universities) the planning, support, and review authority over competency development of candidates for administrator certification or recertification. Between July 1985 and September 1987, three multi-dimensional sites tested the new law. This paper focuses on three questions that arose from these pilot attempts to place the responsibility for the development of administrator competencies in the hands of local collegial teams: (1) How did those responsible for certification or renewal assess the candidates' existing competencies at the outset of the project? (2) How were the growth plans conceived and carried out? and (3) What procedures were used to assess the outcomes of the development process, and was there evidence of growth that could serve as a basis for certification decisions? Findings showed that Maine administrators and aspirants to administration were unable to make the Administrator Action Plan work cleanly for three reasons. First, field-based assessment teams lacked a common conceptual model for administrative competency against which to define and measure performance. Second, practicing administrators did not have time to provide continuous, first-hand observation of performance and personal feedback to candidates. Finally, the field-based administrator certification programs were afflicted with ambiguity about their goals. Nevertheless, the pilot programs did provide collegial networks the support and responsibility for professional growth, and were therefore valued by participants. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED301936

Field-Initiated Administrator Competency Development: A Pilot Experience

Gordon A. Donaldson, Jr.
University of Maine

Andrew Seager
RMC Research Corporation

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA 1988

EA 020 466

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gordon A. Donaldson, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Field-Initiated Administrator Competency Development: A Pilot Experience

Gordon A. Donaldson, Jr., University of Maine
Andrew Seager, RMC Research Corporation

Since the tide of teacher reform crested in the mid-1980's, issues concerning the quality and preparation of school administrators have come increasingly into the public arena (Gousha, LoPresti, and Jones, 1987; Gibboney, 1987). In Maine, an unusual legislative attempt to turn teacher certification and professional development over to the field gave way, in 1985, to a similar initiative for administrators. This paper will examine some findings from pilot attempts to place the responsibility for the development of administrator competencies in the hands of local collegial teams.

Maine bill L.D. 1228, passed in June of 1985, changed the groundrules for administrator certification for both current and future administrators in Maine. In place of a law which required university coursework, teaching experience, and meager internship experience, the legislature created a system which many hoped would serve as more than simply a gamut to certification. The new law had three purposes: a) to define broadly the competencies expected of school administrators and to tie certification to them; b) to open multiple routes for prospective and practicing administrators to gain and enhance competencies; and c) to give district-based administrators and others planning, support, and review authority over the competency development of candidates for certification or recertification. Underlying this last purpose was a barely concealed ambition to break the state's sole reliance

on university courses as a means for both professional development and certification, an ambition which grew both from displeasure with these courses and from the belief that competencies would more readily develop through field-based, "hands-on" experiences than through coursework and university practica. It is this last purpose which is the topic of this paper.

In particular, we shall address three questions which arose in the twenty-six months during which Maine districts pilot tested the new law. We have selected them because they are endemic to programs of competency development (Leithwood, 1987) and because they are of particular importance to certification reforms which are modeled on competency development (Gousha, et al, 1987). First, how did local teams or individuals responsible for certification or renewal assess administrators' (or prospective administrators') existing competencies at the outset of the project? Second, how were growth plans conceived and carried out? And third, what procedures were used to assess the outcomes of the development process and was there evidence of growth that could serve as a basis for certification decisions?

The Sites and the Authors' Access

Between July, 1985 and September, 1987, three multi-district sites tested the new law. Site A, a consortium of six suburban districts east of Portland, concentrated its efforts on certificate renewal among existing administrators and included, at maximum, twenty-three administrators representing different roles. Site A used a mentor model in which administrators were paired for assessment, growth plan development, and assessment of progress.

Site B consisted of seven districts northwest of Augusta, including Augusta as well as several rural districts. It devised and tested its own procedures for both initial administrator certification and renewal using both mentors and "support teams" of administrators, university, and state personnel. Twenty-eight educators, of whom twelve were practicing administrators and sixteen were teachers aspiring to administration took part in Site B. Site C was located in northern Maine and was highly university-driven (it will not be included in this discussion).

The authors were hired to monitor and evaluate the three pilot projects and to submit a report to the State Board of Education and the Legislature prior to the development of regulations and the implementation of the new system (July 1988). In addition to documentary and on-site observation, half of the fifty-one administrator candidates were interviewed twice each (winter 1986; May 1987). In addition, all personnel who served on support teams or as mentors were surveyed concerning their roles as assessors, collegial supporters, and evaluators of professional growth. A sample of candidate administrators, as well, completed a self-assessment instrument derived from established work on instructional management (Hallinger and Murphy, 1986) and on professional efficacy (Bandura, 1977; Gibson and Dembo, 1984). Finally, each candidate submitted weekly logs of activities throughout the project as well as professional growth plans and, where possible, evidence of completion.

From these data, the authors developed a comprehensive report describing the events of each pilot, the organizational structures

that developed to support activities, the assessment of professional development needs, the planning for their fulfullment, and the final evaluation of outcomes (Donaldson and Seager, 1987). This paper limits itself to the assessment and evaluation issues that arose and to the evidence of expected outcomes the authors were able to collect.

Initial Assessments of Competencies

If a candidate's certificate is to reflect his/her possession of certain knowledge and competency, a valid and reliable means of assessing the presence of that knowledge and those competencies must exist. More particularly, if the certificate of a practicing administrator is to reflect the existence of those competencies, its renewal must hinge on evidence of their continuing existence or, as was the case in many instances in Maine, of their enhancement. The Maine consortia of districts were encouraged to pilot test the concept of "administrator action plans" (AAPs), professional growth plans which were undefined in law but which were interpreted by Sites A and B to involve knowledge and skill assessments, goal-setting, action plans, and deadlines for certification purposes.

In both sites, the problem of establishing a baseline against which to measure the growth of competencies was ever present. Although the law provided a general description of the competency areas, it left to the local mentor pairs and support teams the task of defining these in operational terms. Hence, the "state list" was not truly a list of competencies but was rather a list of "areas" in which a candidate was required to demonstrate a

"basic level of knowledge." The list was:

Community relations;
School finance and budget;
Supervision and evaluation of personnel;
Federal and state civil rights and education laws;
Organizational theory and planning;
Education leadership;
Educational philosophy and theory;
Effective instruction;
Curriculum development;
Staff development; and
Other competency areas as determined by state board rule.

How did pairs of administrators, in the case of Site A, and teams of administrators (or others) in Site B, establish a beginning point for the professional growth plans of candidates? The two sites developed differently in this respect, and the differences have important consequences for the viability of the Maine certification model. Before examining the differences, however, it should be noted that the initial response to the task of baseline assessment was to ask the candidate to conduct a self-assessment. In both sites, candidates were required to submit a portfolio of their educational background, their work history, their leadership and administrative experiences, and their evaluations of current development goals.

In Site A, two additional steps were taken to establish the baseline. First, workshops were provided during the summer which, partly by design, offered candidates current models and research findings as criteria to use in further self-assessment. These included descriptions of "effective leadership" as well as specific designs for effective supervison and the feedback conference. A second step, however, proved more popular with many administrators; the Peer Assisted Leadership training (Farwest

Regional Labs) was offered to candidates and it became the basis for more of the mentor relationships than any other model. Here, administrators were trained in a process of mutual observation, assistance in identifying existing performance patterns, and assistance in setting goals for development. The initial competency assessments which evolved from the mentor pairs in Site A were highly individualized and bore no consistent relationship to either the state list or any other single model of leadership competencies.

In Site B, a more heavily centralized system evolved. After candidates had been asked to submit self-evaluations, the steering committee of representatives from each district accurately concluded that they reflected little common understanding of the competencies outlined in the state list. In fact, they realized that the self-evaluation task had proven almost impossible for teachers aspiring to administration because they had no conceptual basis and little experiential basis on which to establish their self-assessments. In response, the Site B steering committee did three things.

Using committees composed of local administrators, university personnel, and an occasional state department of education representative, they developed lists of "behavioral indicators" to accompany each of the "knowledge areas" on the state list (see appendix A). They then strongly urged candidates, with their mentors or support teams, to use these as a blueprint for conducting individual needs assessments and, subsequently, writing growth plans. Second, they arranged several workshops for

candidates which provided either leadership or supervisory models (e.g., Madeleine Hunter) or a specific means of further self-assessment (Myers-Briggs and Bernice McCarthy learning styles inventories). Third, the steering committee arranged an on-site session of th NASSP Assessment Center for ten prospective administrators. Of the three structured means of assistance, the last one, with its activity-based competencies and observation-based assesment procedures, was considered by far the most helpful by candidates.

Our independent evaluation of the administrator action plans concluded that, in many instances, these initial assessments in both sites were flawed in number of ways (Donaldson and Seager, 1987). First, they were not specific enough to identify clearly a discrete skill or area of knowledge which a candidate could address in a plan. For example, candidates often listed a need to increase their knowledge of "school law" or "the clinical supervision model" but provided no further details to pinpoint what this meant. Second, they were not consistently based on the state list, except in the case of candidates for initial certification. In the most common case, candidates' assessments of what they needed to improve were described not in terms of what specific capabilities they needed to develop but in terms of goals and tasks which their immediate job demanded. For example, one candidate's action plan included the development of a curriculum review process in his school; the "developmental need" was expressed as the school's rather than his own (although the two were not necessarily incompatible), and the plan reflected this

emphasis. Third, the quality and substance of assessments was uneven from candidate to candidate, as might be expected in a situation where little training had occurred. One candidate's self-assessment, for example, stood as her "baseline evaluation" while another's included detailed observational data from the Assessment Center. And finally, little evidence of systematic external assessment existed at all and, concomitantly, reliable assessment data on which to building an administrator action plan was largely absent.

Clearly, this last problem was a collossal one. Although it was not essential that a licensure decision be based on evidence of growth (i.e., comparison of initial competencies with endpoint competencies), the manner in which Maine's sites approached the pilot testing (with state encouragement) emphasized a professional development model in which increases in demonstrated proficiencies were essential. Hence, the difficulties described above obstructed significantly the system from working in a logical, verifiable manner. As we shall see later, particularly in Site B, the absence of detailed, valid initial assessment data did not necessarily deter candidates and mentors/support teams from perceiving that growth was occurring.

Administrator Action Plans

Both pilot sites employed the concept of an administrator action plan (AAP) as the instrument for professional growth. Although the AAP was modeled after Maine's new teacher certification law in which candidates for new certificates use a

"teacher action plan," neither the structure nor the process surrounding the AAP were specified in the law. Each site developed its own model (see appendix B). In Site A, the action plan included a description of the candidate's current position, of the "problem identification/needs assessment" process used to arrive at the plan, and a "worksheet" on which the candidate was to relate "needs," "goals/expected outcomes," "activities," "timeline," "resources," and "evaluation plans." In Site B, the plan was structured by the state list of "competencies," with "goals" and related "activities" designated under each competency. Each "activity" was to include an "evaluation" procedure, the name of a mentor or support team member, and the dates of commencement and completion.

Neither of these models was flawed in an obvious way. They both used a goal-based development process reminiscent of many rational planning designs. The employment of the action plans, however, bore surprisingly little resemblance to the models. In particular, the development activities noted in the AAPs were characterized by the following attributes:

1. school-specific, job-related: The majority of AAPs committed candidates to complete activities directly related to their jobs. These were generally activities which were new to the candidate, but there was no indication that the activity would provide that candidate with a generalizable skill which could be used in the future.

2. isolated, discrete units: The activities generally identified specific tasks and objectives in the work setting and they generally resulted in products; however, seldom was the connection to a specific competency standard clearly drawn. Thus, for instance, a candidate committed herself to create a bibliography, but did not state that the books would be read, that there would be any reflection on their contents if they were read, and no person was identified to review the bibliography for its appropriateness to developing

administrative capabilities.

3. conventional activities: In the majority of cases, candidates and their mentors/support teams presented conventional professional development activities as their plan for building administrative competencies. Most common were university courses (frequently the same ones required for certification under the old regulations); many included workshops, including those arranged by the pilot sites which provided general background rather than specifically targeted forms of professional educaiton.

4. absence of integration: In general, where goals were related to the state list of competencies, they were directly related to a single competency, such as building familiarity with civil rights or special education law or learning the Hunter supervision model. Rarely did the plan provide for the integration of discrete knowledge into a more general operational capability of the sort often mentioned in recent literature on administration. The absence of a "human relations" competency symbolized this tendency toward viewing administration as a segmented or serial activity.

These observations on the administrator action plan activities highlight the difficulties local teams experienced in simply identifying what constitutes good administrator training. Given the vagaries of this process even among those in universities who devote their full attention to it, we were not surprised to find relatively little clear direction or innovative spirit in the sites. On the other hand, we must add that many candidates and many mentors/support team members testified that their experiences were vastly more productive than these rather flacid action plans described. That is, the relationship between the candidate and the mentor or team was vital to the quality of the experience and, once that relationship was established, a great deal more occurred than had been written in the plan or, for that matter, could easily be reported in an evaluation.

Put another way, these pilots asked full-time administrators and teachers to integrate into their workdays activities which

would create and enhance administrative skills and knowledge. Not only were time and energy immediate obstacles for them, but the absence of useful models for understanding administrator development seemed even more frustrating. Viewed from this standpoint, the fact that most teams turned to conventional, isolated opportunities (i.e., those that were available) is not surprising. The need to provide training and orientation for mentors and support teams as well as to suggest and demonstrate model activities that exploit the field base was most apparent in these pilots (although less so in Site A, where the PAL training appeared to have, however gradually, promised to fulfill this need).

Evaluating Evidence of Outcomes

In the context of certification, the measurement of competency levels is of course central to the success of the administrator development process. In the past in Maine, the only measurement involved in administrator certification has been the grading of university courses and, less frequently, the evaluation of internship experiences. The new law, by giving the field leadership and responsibility for training, effected the evaluation problem in two ways. It increased the complexity of evaluation by designating broad competency areas and by potentially involving many people in the evaluation process. And it increased the ambiguity of evaluation by encouraging that it be tied to performance.

We observed the evaluation process in action in a number of

instances in Site B and we collected through document review and interviews evidence of evaluation procedures and outcomes from each of the fifty-one candidates. Further, we surveyed one quarter of the candidates to obtain independent measures of their perceived competency levels and their sense of professional efficacy (given the manner in which the pilots developed, however, it was impossible to do pre/post administrations).

In Site B, fourteen candiates completed the activities in their action plans and applied for certification or renewal prior to September 1987. Each candidate was required to assemble evidence of completion and to obtain the written recommendation of his or her support team signifying that the plan had been successfully completed (a step which, as noted above, did not necessarily imply that the competencies were in place). In turn, the chairperson of the team took the plan and evidence and presented it to the inter-district Advisory Committee which juried the candidacy prior to recommending approval or denial of certification to the state.

The presentation of candidates was conducted formally, with the chairperson typically running down the list of ten competency areas on the state list, noting the AAP's disposition regarding each area, stating the candidate's actual activities, and finishing with a statement of the team's evaluation. These evaluations took the form of several types of evidentiary statement:

. completion of coursework reported to cover the competency

> for example: "Regarding the theory competency, he'd taken EAD 550 ("Theories of Administration", University

of Maine), so we signed off. With respect to the Instructional Design competency, he'd had EAD 550, EAD 615 ("The Principalship", Univeristy of Maine), and had redesigned adult education for the district. We felt he was proficient at the entry level."

- evidence that an AAP activity had been completed

  for example: "She (candidate) either verified (with documentation) that she'd done the activity to the support team or I (chairperson) verified it to the team."

- evidence from prior work experience that a competency area was covered

  for example: "Given his background in special education (as a teacher) and his coursework in supervision and administration, we felt he'd done enough (to merit recommendation for the principalship)."

- testimony by the candidate or by others that the competency was present at a sufficient level of quality

  for example: "I (chairperson) have a record of her supervision of one teacher. It was a very successful experience; she really turned around this marginal teacher."

  or: "In our conversations with him (candidate), he most certainly felt he had a good handle on budgeting."

  or: "(The university faculty member on the support team) thought his grasp of entry level skills in supervision was certainly acceptable."

- testimony by the chairperson as to the effort and general ability of the candidate

  for example: "The support team was very pleased with (the candidate's) effort, felt he went well beyond what the plan stipulated, so we recommend approval."

  or: "I think he's a real bright and conscientious person."

Although these remarks appear hollow when removed from the context of the meeting, they convey the real difficulties experienced by all participants in documenting the existence of competencies. In many instances, neither the chairperson nor

another team member had actually witnessed the candidate demonstrating the competency because they had little sustained access to the candidate's direct activities. So they relied on reports from the candidate, on written documentation, and on reports from educators who had observed the candidate. Support team members and mentors, in turn, were asked to represent this evidence to the Advisory Committee, who then were relying on second-hand if not third-hand data. Given the obstacles of direct candidate observation and those of assembling and presenting evidence of competencies in all ten areas, it was not surprising that most evidence was in the form of either factual statements of the completion of courses or activities or general testimonials from educators acquainted with a candidate's work.

In either case, the evaluation of growth in the Maine sites relied heavily on self-reported data. For this reason, the authors developed an instrument to make possible comparisons among candidates' self-assessments at the end of the pilot period. The instrument incorporated items dealing with instructional management from the "Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale" (Hallinger and Murphy, 1986), items dealing with professional efficacy (Gibson and Dembo, 1984), and items constructed to match competency areas on the Maine list that were not covered by the preceeding instruments. The instrument was pilot tested for face validity among seven candidates for initial certification and five candidates for renewal (who were currently holding administrative positions). The premature termination of the pilot project evaluation prevented the administration of the

instrument to all fifty-one participants.

The results of the survey, clearly, cannot be considered either valid or reliable without more study. Nonetheless, two observations are deemed useful to this discussion, if only on a speculative plane. First, most of the twelve candidates rated themselves more "confident" of their ability to handle the less well defined tasks of goal-setting, communication, school climate, and providing instructional assistance than they did their ability to budget, supervise plant operation, employ psychological principles, or use "law" properly. That is, the self-evaluations of these twelve stressed their need to learn the specialized, cognitive schema of school management more than it did their need to integrate behavioral and conceptual skills in action. Second, the seven candidates for initial certification as principals proved to be more "bullish" on themselves as potential administrators than were the experienced administrators. Though hardly verifiable in a statistical sense, the novices consistently reported themselves more confident of their ability to handle tasks than did veterans.

These observations raise more questions about the effects of the pilot experiences. In particular, they suggest that candidates themselves emerge from 18 to 24 months of activity in the Maine certification model with fairly positive feelings about their ability to serve as administrators. On what evidence do they base these feelings? Is it evidence that can be deemed valid and reliable by an external review? Particularly in the case of the novice, were these ambitious assessments inflated by false

confidence or by an optimism borne of ignorance of the difficulties and complexities of "real" administrative work? Or, has the field-based model permitted the development of confidence in a way that courses cannot? If so, has it done so by separating learning about administration from being responsible for administrative outcomes?

Conclusion

These questions should fuel further research on field-based certification and competency development. Certainly, they are central to certification reform in Maine as well as in other states such as Florida which have cast their lot with those who combine competency development and certification in field-based developmental experiences. Maine's experience, however, has raised more questions than it has laid to rest (admittedly, the short pilot period has contributed to this fact in a significant way).

Maine administrators and aspirants to administration were plagued by their inabilities to make the Administrator Action Plan work cleanly. These difficulties appear to have had three sources. The first, and most basic, was intrinsic to the AAP model itself. Assuming that professional preparation will be enhanced through a diagnostic-prescriptive process, the AAP required that candidates, mentors, and support teams be able to assess the initial state of competence for each candidate, build a program of development upon that assessment, and evaluate the "end" condition. In Maine, this model proved unworkable for two apparent reasons. First, field-based teams lacked a common,

detailed conceptual model for administrative competency on which to base assessments, growth plans, assistance, and evaluation decisions. Second, candidates and teams were unable to operationally define and measure candidate performance against the conceptual models they did use (such as they were).

A second major issue arose from the assumption that working educators could create the developmental milieu for one another and for novices entering administration. Despite the well intentioned notion that "the profession can best build and sustain itself", professional administrators cannot easily take the time to assist one another or a teacher in moving toward administrative competency. This is especially true in rural states, where intra-district or intra-school travel is time-consuming and where administrators are often working alone in a school or district. At the root of this issue is the apparent need for field-based competency development to provide frequent face-to-face contact between candidate and mentor or support team. This need afflicted the Maine sites in two ways: 1) if a candidate was to assimilate new information and accomodate new behaviors, both feedback and support needed to be <u>continuous</u> and <u>personal</u>; 2) if certification decisions were to be validly and reliably based on performance competencies, they needed to be <u>documented</u> <u>through</u> <u>continuous</u>, <u>first-hand</u> <u>observation</u> of performance. Clearly, neither of these conditions was met in the Maine pilot sites.

Finally, the field-based administrator certification pilots in Maine suffered from a form of goal ambiguity which has pestered other states' certification reform attempts as well (Malen and

Hart, 1987). Maine, with LD 1228, attempted simultaneously to upgrade certification and encourage professional development among administrators. To some degree, we observed difficulties in the pilot sites which stemmed from the lack of fit between these two goals. Were candidates to set development goals based on their own local perceptions of need or should they force their needs assessment to the terms of the "state list"? Whose responsibility (or right) was it to judge the suitability of a "development activity" on an AAP? If the PAL pair agreed on an activity's merit, could a review panel more distant from the performance level legitimately raise questions? And what criteria were to serve as a basis for final evaluations of development or of competency? What rules of evidence were to apply? In Maine, Site A's focus on certification renewal carried it naturally in the direction of the professional development goal, while Site B attempted to combine accountability measures (as in the behavioral indicators list and the Advisory Committee's final review) with opportunities for professional development.

Despite these obvious difficulties in the execution of Maine's new certification model, a curious optimism characterized the participants. Many, in fact, seemed unconcerned that the AAP process was flawed and chose instead to testify at length to the value of the locally-initiated development experience. That is, the rational plan for certification and development incorporated in the law seemed unworkable: Field-based competency development among administrators simply does not fit the clean, logical terms of a diagnostic-prescriptive model (it appears, once again, that

the world of schools is not so serial and rational). On the other hand, Maine's law gave prospective administrators and working administrators control over their own development goals and activities and, importantly, forced a degree of local interaction around them. Particularly in the case of mentor pairs, such as the PAL pairs in Site A, both candidates and mentors vigorously reported benefits to the experience. And, despite their inability to operationalize the competencies in measurable terms, support teams and mentors often felt confident of their final assessments of candidates; their access to multiple sources of data often gave them a better sense of a candidate's preparation than, for example, a university practicum supervisor might have.

We came away from our observation of the pilots in Maine doubtful that the new law could make certification consistently reflect admistrator competencies. We were, nevertheless, intrigued by the possibilities of giving collegial networks the support and responsibility for professional growth. Indeed, similarities to the growing success of principals' centers and administrator institutes are obvious (Wimpelberg, 1987). From these experiences, it would appear that Maine's daring attempt to renew administrative certification by encouraging professional field-based development will require considerable change in our conceptions of school administration. Administrators, their schools, and their districts will need to allot time and energy to the activities and associations which are crucial to the development competencies in the complex and dynamic work of school administration. In effect, Maine's pilots reflected the need for

time and training to teach participants and their work environments a new model of professional growth and performance, one which must rely on "systemic organizational changes" for its survival (Boyd, 1987). Though fraught with problems, both practical and conceptual, the fact that administrators were inspired by the pilot opportunity and that the state continues to support a field-based model is encouraging.

References

Bandura, A. (1977). Self efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84, 191-215.

Boyd, William Lowe. "Public education's last hurrah?: Schizophrenia, amnesia, and ignorance in school politics." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 9, 85-100.

Donaldson, G. and A. Seager (1987) Decentralizing Maine administrator certification: A study of the sites funded to pilot the requirements for administrator certification.Nashua N.H.: RMC Research Corporation.

Gibboney, Richard A. (1987). "Education of administrators: An American tragedy. Education Week. April 15, 1987, p. 28.

Gibson, S. and M. Dembo (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. Journal of Educationa Psychology, 76, 569-582.

Gousha, Richard, Peter LoPresti, and Alan Jones (1987). "Mapping a dynamic field: Results from the second annual survey of certification and employment standards for educational administrators." Presentation to the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. Chadron, Nebraska, August, 1987.

Hallinger, P. and J. Murphy (1984). The principal instructional management rating scale. Scarsdale, N.Y.: Leading Development Associates.

Leithwood, Kenneth A. (1987). Using "The Principal Profile" to assess performance. Educational Leadership, 45, 63-66.

Malen, Betty and Ann Weaver Hart (1987). Career ladder reform: A multi-level analysis of initial efforts. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 9, 9-23.

Wimpelberg, R. (1987). The inservice development of principals: A new movement, its characteristics, and future. To appear in Advances in Educational Administration, Vol. 1. (Thurston and Lotto, Eds.). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

APPENDIX A

Final Draft: 4/10/86

1. Community Relations

Competency	Behavioral Indicators
Informs, invites and involves the community, in a collaborative manner, with goal setting and implementation of school/system policies and practices.	1.1. Takes overall responsibility for establishing and maintaining open lines of communication and involvement with the community. 1.2. Designs and implements strategies to promote positive school/community relationships. 1.3. Promotes activities that encourage community members to participate in the life of the school/system. 1.4. Articulates the importance of education as a top priority in the community. 1.5. Demonstrates the ability to listen and obtain community opinion.

2. Finance and Budget

Competency	Behavioral Indicators
Demonstrates an understanding of the budget preparation process and the management of the categories that support the goals and objectives of the school/system.	2.1. Understands the district budget and its implications for the local school. 2.2. Plans and prepares the school/system budget. 2.3. Manages the program within the allocated resources. 2.4. Interprets budget priorities and constraints to the school staff and community. 2.5. Shows knowledge of the district accounting system. 2.6. Demonstrates knowledge in the funding of schools (subsidies). 2.7. Creates alternatives to school funding, i.e. Innovative Grants, Foundations, Trust Funds.

3. Supervision and Evaluation of Personnel

Competency	Behavioral Indicators
Supervises and evaluates the effectiveness of the personnel responsible for the delivery of the school program.	3.1. Demonstrates a knowledge of techniques and strategies to assess the performance of school personnel.
	3.2. Knows due process procedures and legal requirements in disciplinary, non-renewal and dismissal cases.
	3.3. Develops assistance plans and/or remediation efforts to improve the performance of personnel.
	3.4. Assists teachers in the development of professional and instructional goals and objectives.
	3.5. Demonstrates knowledge of clinical supervisory techniques including systematic observation of teaching and effective conferencing skills.
	3.6. Constructs formative and summative evaluations.

4. Federal and State Civil Rights and Educational Laws

Competency	Behavioral Indicators
The candidate demonstrates knowledge of national, state, and local laws and applies this knowledge in the day to day decision making which affects students and employees.	4.1. Designs and implements school policies which are consistent with the law, board policy, and contractual agreements which incorporate the elements of "due process" for both students and personnel.
	4.2. Reviews school/system policies in order to determine whether or not they are legally and educationally sound.
	4.3. Maintains a familiar, current, and working knowledge of federal and state civil rights and educational laws.
	4.4. Communicates awareness of civil rights and legal changes in education to the school community.
	4.5. Demonstrates proficiency in the administration of negotiated agreements.
	4.6. Seeks legal or technical assistance when required.
	4.7. Demonstrates the knowledge of the collective bargaining process.

5. Organizational Theory and Planning

Competency	Behavioral Indicators
Plans for and schedules educational activities and the use of staff and other resources to accomplish organizational goals.	5.1. Establishes schedules, budgets, time and organizes appropriately for quality school programming.
	5.2. Reviews tasks and establishes priorities utilizing principals of effective time management.
	5.3. Uses research in making program decisions.
	5.4. Uses school staff and student data appropriately and confidentially.
	5.5. Supports the utilization and training of volunteers.
	5.6. Supervises the operation and maintenance of the physical plant.
	5.7. Demonstrates ability to plan and implement long and short range goals.
	5.8. Utilizes participatory decision-making where appropriate to accomplish the mission of the school.
	5.9. Communicates information to the appropriate school and community members in a timely fashion.
	5.10. Designs and implements appropriate emergency, safety, and health procedures.
	5.11. Recognizes the contributions of staff and community members.

6. Educational leadership

Competency	Behavioral Indicators
Plans and implements an instructional management system based on sound educational philosophy and learning theory including learning objectives, curriculum design and instructional strategies that encourage high levels of achievement.	6.1. Participates as a member of local, state and national professional associations.
	6.2. Serves as an effective change agent.
	6.3. Participates in an ongoing program of personal/professional growth and development.
	6.4. Promotes a positive school/system climate based on respect, trust, high morale, and academic development.
	6.5. Assumes responsibility for behavior management.
	6.6. Visits classrooms, holds discussions with students, shows interest in new ideas, is visible and accessible to the school community.
	6.7. Communicates openly, listens actively and encourages others to do the same.
	6.8. Uses clear, concise, properly constructed forms of written and oral communication.
	6.9. Analyzes information relative to problems, makes decisions, and delegates responsibility as appropriate.
	6.10. Creates a strong sense of togetherness to accomplish the mission of the school.
	6.11. Identifies and utilizes human, material, and financial resources creatively to achieve school goals.
	6.12. Encourages creative and high level thinking skills.

7. Educational Philosophy and Theory

Competency	Behavioral Indicators
Demonstrates knowledge in educational philosophy and learning theory and applies these in the educational setting.	7.1. Understands and promotes the teaching/learning process which includes contemporary instructional patterns and professionally accepted instructional techniques and strategies.
	7.2. Articulates, orally and in writing, to the educational community a philosophy that promotes learning as a life long activity and which includes values and beliefs consistent with the educational program.
	7.3. Demonstrates knowledge of child/adolescent growth and development patterns.
	7.4. Establishes and maintains a positive learning environment to bring about the motivation and social integration of students and staff.

8. Effective Instruction

Competency	Behavioral Indicators
Guides and assists personnel in planning and implementing instructional strategies that match the curriculum and student learning needs.	8.1. Organizes the educational programs to assure maximum use of time on tasks.
	8.2. Assists teachers in developing specific learning objectives for students.
	8.3. Assists teachers in the acquisition and refinement of effective instructional and classroom management skills.
	8.4. Establishes an environment for successful learning.
	8.5. Promotes and uses principles of child/adolescent growth and development.
	8.6. Assists teachers in the use of appropriate student assessment in diagnosis of student needs and design of instructional programs.
	8.7. Assists teachers in the identification and use of appropriate instructional support services (i.e., counseling remediation, special education).
	8.8. Assists teachers in the use of appropriate instructional grouping patterns to facilitate learning.
	8.9. Establishes and models high expectations for students, staff, and self.

9. Curriculum Development

Competency	Behavioral Indicators
Assumes leadership for identifying desired student skills and in the planning of curriculum design, implementation, and modification.	9.1. Ensures that the school's curriculum is supported by adequate resources of time, money, materials and personnel.
	9.2. Works with staff to develop a written curriculum K-12 built around specific, measurable learning objectives which comprise a continuum of learning.
	9.3. Participates actively in collaboration with the staff and community in the development and review of the system-wide curriculum.
	9.4. Maintains an environment of excellence marked by high expectations and persistent striving toward mastery levels of achievement.
	9.5. Monitors teaching and testing data to ensure that curriculum objectives are being met.
	9.6. Encourages appropriate student extra-curricular activities.
	9.7. Demonstrates knowledge and techniques of curriculum design, development, and evaluation.

10. Staff Development

Competency	Behavioral Indicators
Supports and encourages personnel to participate in personal/professional activities which enhance the mission of the school/system.	10.1. Utilizes evaluations of staff/student strengths and weaknesses.
	10.2. Assists personnel in developing specific goals for personal/professional development.
	10.3. Assists in the design of effective staff and professional development programs which match personal and organizational goals.
	10.4. Supports staff development through the use of budget, time and resources.
	10.5. Designs effective staff and professional development programs which match personal and organizational goals.

APPENDIX B

SITE A

I-95 CONSORTIUM
ADMINISTRATOR CERTIFICATION PILOT
ACTION PLAN
DUE JANUARY 1, 1987

Administrator: _____

Position: Superintendent

School System: Freeport Public Schools

Mentor/Support: _____

Date Submitted: November 29, 1986

Date Accepted:

Certificate: Superintendent

Because this is a pilot project testing the viability of the Administrator Certification Law, an evaluator may interview you or review this action plan.

Accepted November [illegible] 1986

INTRODUCTION

Describe your present position and state the purposes of this action plan. Consider your responsibilities relative to buildings, staff, programs, students and the community. Limit your remarks to this page and highlight those areas which will set the stage for your personal development plan.

As superintendent of the _____ schools, I am responsible for approximately 1050 students in grades K-12 housed in two elementary, one middle and one high school. While school buildings are generally in excellent condition, shifts in enrollment have created the need to plan for additional space: increased kindergarten classes over the last three years are producing pressure on elementary space, while the high school desperately needs a new gymnasium, and auditorium for our excellent music and drama programs, as well as community-use rooms and a renovated cafeteria. In order to meet these needs, the Town Council has established two building committees, one for our Early Childhood Center for grades K-1, and a high school committee. I serve as a member of both committees and will be responsible for the staff work, assisted by the two school principals who are working on this as part of their action plans.

_____ is experiencing rapid economic growth, increased residential construction accompanied by higher enrollments and a shift in values in the community which affects the community's expectations for the schools and indicates the need to redirect the instructional emphasis from one of preparing fishermen and shoe factory workers towards the rising percentage of students preparing for college. While Freeport's level of state support has fallen from 52% to 27% in the last three years, the percentage of students going on to further education has risen from 28% to 42%.

In addition to the needs connected to school demographics, the chairmanship of the I-95 Certification Pilot has provided the opportunity to become involved in statewide activities and has made it necessary to examine training opportunities for administrators, especially those seeking recertification in their positions.

I completed the course work and comprehensive exams for the Ed.D. degree this fall and intend to begin on the dissertation immediately.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Provide an overview of the problem identification/needs assessment process you used to arrive at your plan. Indicate who was involved in that process. Describe how the assessment information was gather, e.g., performance appraisal, literature review, formalized assessment instruments, a reflective interview, or self-assessment. For the purposes of this pilot, your goals should be achievable by December 1, 1987.

1. Changing demographics and socio-economic characteristics of the town and schools defined the need for planning activities to direct the necessary change. Planning models, an analysis of the political process, systems dynamics and leadership research formed the basis for my doctoral course work at _____ during the past year. Our system's needs became obvious during that process and led to the planning model for raising aspirations. The faculty at _____ and _____ Administrative team and School Committee assisted in the process.

2. The Certification Pilot activity allowed me to examine my style as a learner, a leader and as a member of a group. I hope to improve it increasing reflection and right-brained idea generation activities as part of my Peer Assisted Leadership experience and through structuring further workshop offerings for I-95 administrators.

3. The needs of the system for new buildings and the establishment of two building committees make it necessary for me to be familiar with the school building process. Reality dictated this goal.

4. Having completed course work and comprehensive examinations in the Ed.D. program at _____, my goal for the coming year consists in gaining acceptance of the dissertation proposal (first 3 chapters). Since I do not have a complete committee at this time, this stage will consume the major part of 1987.

PROJECT ACTION PLAN

Develop a worksheet for your action plan. Demonstrate the relationship each component has to the others. Goals should be derived from your identified needs. For each goal, list the activities you will use, when they will occur, the resources you will need and an evaluation plan you will follow.

1 GOAL: (Choose one or two key items from page 2)	2 OBJECTIVES: What will I be able to do more effectively at the end of this program?	3 ACTIVITIES: What specific activities will I take to reach my goals?	4 TIMING: When will each activity begin and end?	5 EVENTS: List material and human resources required (money or support personnel) for each activity	6 EVALUATION: How will I measure my professional development through this activity?
1. Pitching application	1. How to plan and effect change	1. Institute a student recognition program 2. Write/help/publicize info about student achievement 3. Produce appropriate P.R. materials 4. Support teacher workshops, visits, support team 5. Obtain funding for student college visits	1988-87 school year Summer 1987 Jan. 87-Dec. 87 Help? 87	S.C. meeting time certificates, plan, the Bulletin, area newspapers, letters to parents. Supt's Newsletter. Help from appropriate people: Frequent Administrators Regional Lab Inservice funds, budget, funds	Record of recognition meeting, sample letters Prepare a summative report for board and staff development committee/record of visits
2. Certification Pilot	2. How to find problem schools, [illegible], use my skills better, work as a member and with a member	1. Participate in PR training 2. Chair committee meetings, give required reports 3. Plan administrative training	Dec. 86-June 87 Jan. 86-Dec. 87 Jan. 87-Dec. 87	_____, member _____ Grant monies	PR document Certification Pilot minutes State Board rating
3. School Building	3. How to follow requirements for planning a school construction project and, when necessary initiate	1. Work with building committee/ meetings 2. Submit appropriate forms 3. Gain S.C. & central approval 4. Forward plans to State Board if favorable rating 5. Additional proposals, site visits and possible if not favorable 6. Review meetings	Developed period by November Receive July 1987 July-Dec. 1987	Building Committee Elementary Principal H.S. Principal as liaison; architect's fees from Level II; Host Realm as member	Meeting appropriate officers If favorable rating, obtain financial support from Level II Report on activities completed with member, S.C. and regional members
4. Orientation	4. To gain acceptance of proposal (First Board phase)	1. Form a committee 2. Review literature search 3. Complete/research survey 4. Prepare graphic aid to visual presentation 5. Submit proposal, gain acceptance of proposal at meeting of committee	Nov. 86-Dec. 87	Selina Advisor/Committee Computer software, disks, home computer	Letter from accepting proposal

APPENDIX F

SITE #3

SAMPLE SAMPLE

KENNEBEC VALLEY ADMINISTRATOR CERTIFICATION PILOT
ADMINISTRATOR ACTION PLAN

Augusta Public Schools
SAD #47 (Oakland)
SAD #48 (Newport)
SAD #49 (Fairfield)
SAD #54 (Skowhegan)
Union #52 (Winslow)
Waterville Public Schools
University of Maine

NAME: Mary Smith

PRESENT POSITION: Grade 3 Teacher,
Brookville Elementary School, SAD #99

CERTIFICATION SOUGHT: Elementary
Principal-Initial

SUPPORT TEAM MEMBERS/MENTOR:
John Roy, Sally Donovan, Sue Casey

DATE OF SUBMITTAL:
October 15, 1986

ADMINISTRATOR ACTION PLAN

COMPETENCY I: COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Informs, invites, and involves the community in a collaborative manner, with goal setting and implementation of school/system policies and practices.

GOAL A

Improve both one-way and two-way communications with parents and other citizens in the community of Brookville.

ACTIVITY #1

Develop, publish, and distribute three occasional newsletters, highlighting school activities, effective instructional programs, and school policies.

Evaluation: Present samples of each newsletter to support team members.

Location of activity: Brookville Elementary School

Mentor: Beverly Scott, Assistant Principal

Date to commence work: September 15, 1986

Date of completion: May 1, 1987

ACTIVITY #2

Organize and direct a Grandparents'' Day to be held in conjunction with American Education Week.

Evaluation: Present copy of program, press release, and data on number of participants involved to support them.

Location of activity: Brookville Elementary School

Mentor: David Jones, Principal

Date to commence work: September 10, 1986

Date of completion: November 20, 1986

GOAL B

Become more familiar with school-community efforts to evaluate and improve district schools.

ACTIVITY #1

Serve on the district's School Improvement Team, chairing the sub-committee assigned to elementary education.

Evaluation: Provide support team with copies of the minutes of the meetings, as well as recommendations forwarded from the sub-committee to the full School Improvement Team.

Location of activity: district central office

Mentor: Cheryl Smithson, Elementary Supervisor

Date to commence work: October 15, 1986

Date of completion: On-going

COMPETENCY II: FINANCE AND BUDGET

Demonstrates an understanding of the budget preparation process and the management of the categories that support the goals and objectives of the school/system.

GOAL A

Develop a broader perspective of the budget preparation process and the management of allocated funds.

ACTIVITY #1

Assist with the preparation of the 1987-88 textbook and library media center budget requests and monitor the 1986-87 accounts.

Evaluation: Present a letter from David Jones, principal, documenting the extent of participation in the budget process. Submit samples of the textbook/library media budget to support team.

Location of activity: Brookville Elementary School

Mentor: David Jones, Principal

Date to commence work: December 11, 1986

Date of completion: June 1, 1987

ACTIVITY #2

Attend a Department of Educational and Cultural Services informational workshop on the school accounting system. Review district's version of the accounting system with building principal.

Evaluation: Provide support team with agenda and materials distributed at the workshop. Present a self-evaluation statement regarding personal knowledge of the school accounting system.

Location of activity: Augusta

Mentor: DECS staff; David Jones, Principal

Date to commence work: February 10, 1986

Date of completion: February 20, 1986

ACTIVITY #3

Meet with the Superintendent to review the district's guidelines for budget preparation. Review meeting and direct any questions to building principal.

Evaluation: Provide a brief summary of the meeting to the support team, as well as a copy of the questions that were prepared for the principal.

Location of activity: district central office

Mentor: Robert Forbes, Superintendent of Schools; David Jones, Principal

Date to commence work: December 10, 1986

Date of completion: December 20, 1986

ACTIVITY #4

Attend three school board budget workshops to gain insight into the development of a school district budget.

Evaluation: Submit the agendas and minutes of the workshop sessions attended.

Location of activity: district central office

Mentor: David Jones, Principal

Date to commence work: February 15, 1987

Date of completion: March 15, 1987

COMPETENCY III: SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION OF PERSONNEL

Supervises and evaluates the effectiveness of the personnel responsible for the delivery of the school program.

GOAL A

Acquire an initial level of knowledge and skill in clinical supervisory techniques.

ACTIVITY #1

Undertake a general review of the professional literature regarding the development and use of clinical supervisory techniques with prospective and practicing teachers.

Evaluation: Submit an annotated bibliography of the literature review to the support team.

Location of activity: --

Mentor: Beverly Scott, Assistant Principal

Date to commence work: March 1, 1987

Date of completion: June 1, 1987

ACTIVITY #2

Participate in a two-day conference with Dr. Madeline Hunter on effective teaching and supervision.

Evaluation: Present a copy of the agenda and materials from her conference to the support team.

Location of activity: Portland, Maine

Mentor: David Jones, Principal

Date to commence work: February 5, 1986

Date of completion: February 6, 1986

ACTIVITY #3

Complete a practicum involving observation of teaching and conferencing skills.

Evaluation: Present a narrative evaluation from David Jones, outlining activities completed and overall performance.

Location of activity: Brookville Elementary School

Mentor: David Jones, Principal

Date to commence work: October 1, 1986

Date of completion: December 15, 1986

ACTIVITY #4

Complete an in-service center on Joyce's "Models of Teaching."

Evaluation: Submit a transcript on certificate outlining completion of the course.

Location of activity: SAD #101, Forest City

Mentor: Charlene Carey, Instructor

Date to commence work: July 8, 1987

Date of completion: July 26, 1987

COMPETENCY IV: FEDERAL AND STATE CIVIL RIGHTS AND EDUCATIONAL LAWS

Demonstrates knowledge of national, state, and local laws and applies this knowledge in the day-to-day decision-making which affects students and employees.

GOAL A

Acquire an initial level of knowledge regarding school law.

ACTIVITY #1

Complete EAD 531, School Law for Administrators, the College of Education, University of Maine.

Evaluation: Submit a transcript of the course documenting completion and grade earned.

Location of activity: Messalonskee High School

Mentor: John Skehan

Date to commence work: September 5, 1987

Date of completion: December 15, 1987

NOTE: Similar goal statements and activities would be provided for each of the remaining six competency areas. Obviously, the extent and breadth of action plans are affected by each candidate's past experience, education, and whether certification is initial or renewal. Previous experience and education may indicate that a candidate possesses certain competencies, thus eliminating the need for any goals or activities in certain competency areas.